



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,969	07/24/2001	Yukio Kawamura	3479-4000US1	4744

7590 08/01/2003
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053

EXAMINER	HELMS, LARRY RONALD
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1642	13
DATE MAILED: 08/01/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)
	09/911,969 Examiner Larry R. Helms	KAWAMURA ET AL. Art Unit 1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3-12 and 19-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3-12 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/023,731.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). <u>12</u> . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claim 2 has been cancelled and claims 3-5, 9-10, 12 have been amended and claims 19-21 have been added.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35 U.S.C. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior Office Action.
3. The following Office Action contains some NEW GROUNDS of rejection.

Rejections Withdrawn

4. The rejections of claim 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims and arguments and showing of commercial availability of the recited cell lines.
5. The rejection of claims 4-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims.
6. The rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention is withdrawn in view of the public availability of the cell lines in exhibit 2 and 3 and from the online catalog of ATCC for FR3T3 and 3T3 and the Stratagene online catalog for yeast YRG-2 and the UCSD core culture facility on line catalog for HB101.

Application/Control Number: 09/911,969

Art Unit: 1642

7. The rejection of claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pestka (U.S. Patent 6,300,474, filed 6/9/95) is withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims.

8. The rejection of claims 2, 4-10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pestka (U.S. Patent 6,300,474, filed 6/95) as applied to claims 2, 4-9, and 12 above, and further in view of Nagata et al (U.S. Patent 5,874,546, Filed 3/94) is withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims.

The following are NEW GROUNDS of rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 3-12 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 3-12 and 19-21, as written, do not sufficiently distinguish nucleic acids and host cells as they exists naturally because claims do not particularly point out any non-naturally occurring differences between the claimed nucleic acids and host cells and the structure of naturally occurring nucleic acids and host cells. The nucleic acid claimed is from a naturally occurring T. matsutake and as such the claim reads on the naturally occurring nucleic acid. Also the specification contemplates the nucleic acid in a retroviral vector (see page 6, line 9 of the specification). Claim 8 recites a host cell with a retroviral vector of claim 5 which has the nucleotide in it. As such the vector can be a retroviral

Application/Control Number: 09/911,969

Art Unit: 1642

vector and the host cell broadly can be a mouse or human and as such the retroviral vector is incorporated in the genome of the organism and as such claim 8 broadly reads on a transgenic organism which can be a mouse or a human. Therefore claim 8 reads on a naturally occurring organism.

In the absence of the hand of man, the naturally occurring nucleic acids and host cell are considered non-statutory subject matter (Diamond v. Chakrabarty, 206 U.S.P.Q. 193 (1980)). It should be noted that the mere purity of a naturally occurring product does not necessarily impart patentability (Ex parte Siddiqui, 156 U.S.P.Q. 426 (1966)). However, when purification results in a new utility, patentability is considered (Merck Co. v. Chase Chemical Co., 273 F.Supp 68 (1967), 155 USPQ 139, (District Court, New Jersey, 1967)). Amendment of the claims to recite "an isolated or purified" nucleic acid and host cell or similar language would obviate this rejection.

11. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicants broadly claim a host cell containing a vector that comprises a nucleic acid that encodes SEQ ID NO:1. These claims read on a cell within a transgenic animal given that the term "isolated" is not denoted in describing the transgenic cell.

The specification teaches a host cell with vector which has the nucleotide in it. The specification teaches that the vector can be a retroviral vector and the host cell

Application/Control Number: 09/911,969

Art Unit: 1642

broadly can be a mouse or human and as such the retroviral vector is incorporated in the genome of the organism and as such the claims broadly reads on a transgenic organism which can be a mouse or a human.

The state of the art at the time of filing was such that one of skill could not predict the phenotype of transgenics. For example, Overbeek (1994, "Factors affecting transgenic animal production," *Transgenic animal technology*, pages 96-98) taught that within one litter of transgenic mice, considerable variation in the level of transgene expression occurs between founder animals and causes different phenotypes (page 96, last paragraph). The art of transgenic animals has for many years stated that the unpredictability lies, in part, with the site or sites of transgene integration into the target genome and that "the position effect" as well as unidentified control elements are recognized to cause aberrant expression of a transgene (Wall, 1996 *Theriogenology*, Vol. 45, pp. 57-68). The elements of the particular construct used to make transgenic animals are also held to be critical, and they must be designed case by case without general rules to obtain good expression of a transgene; e.g., specific promoters, presence or absence of introns, etc. (Houdebine, 1994, *J. Biotech.* Vol. 34, pages 269-287, specifically page 281). Furthermore, transgenic animals are regarded to have within their cells, cellular mechanisms that prevent expression of the transgene, such as methylation or deletion from the genome (Kappell, 1992, *Current Opinions in Biotechnology*, Vol. 3, pp. 548-553).

Well-regulated transgene expression is not frequently achieved because of poor levels or the complete absence of expression or leaky expression in non-target tissues

Art Unit: 1642

(Cameron, 1997, Molec. Biol. 7, pages 253-265, specifically page 256, col. 1 -2, bridg. parag.). Factors influencing low expression, or the lack thereof, are not affected by copy number and such effects are seen in lines of transgenic mice made with the same construct (Cameron, 1997, Molec. Biol. 7, page 256, lines 3-9). Examples in the literature aptly demonstrate that even closely related species carrying the same transgene construct can exhibit widely varying phenotypes. Mullins (1993, Hypertension, Vol. 22, pp. 630-633) states that not all animals express a transgene sufficiently to provide a model for a disease as the integration of a transgene into different species of animal has been reported to give divergent phenotypes. For example, several animal models of human diseases have relied on transgenic rats when the development of mouse models was not feasible. Mullins (1990, Nature, Vol. 344, 541-544) produced outbred Sprague-Dawley x WKY rats with hypertension caused by expression of a mouse *Ren-2* renin transgene. Hammer (1990, Cell, Vol. 63, 1099-1112) describes spontaneous inflammatory disease in inbred Fischer and Lewis rats expressing human class I major histocompatibility allele HLA-B27 and human β_2 -microglobulin transgenes. Both investigations were preceded by the failure to develop human disease-like symptoms in transgenic mice expressing the same transgenes that successfully caused the desired symptoms in transgenic rats (Mullins, 1989, EMBO J., vol. 8, pages 4065-4072; Taurog, 1988, Jour. Immunol., Vol. 141, pages 4020-4023). Mullins (1996, J. Clin. Invest. Vol. 98, pages S37-S40) disclose that the use of nonmurine species for transgenesis will continue to reflect the suitability of a particular species for the specific questions being addressed, bearing in mind that a given

construct may react very differently from one species to another. Thus, at the time of filing, the phenotype of a transgenic cell contained within any animal was unpredictable and could not be prepared for any species. Applicants can obviate the instant rejection by amending the claims to recite the term "isolated" before "host cell".

Conclusion

12. No claim is allowed.
13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Larry R. Helms, Ph.D, whose telephone number is (703) 306-5879. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00 am to 4:30 pm, with alternate Fridays off. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa, can be reached on (703) 308-3995. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.
14. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Fax Center telephone number is (703) 308-4242.

Application/Control Number: 09/911,969
Art Unit: 1642

Page 8

Respectfully,

Larry R. Helms Ph.D.

703-306-5879



LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER